

**REMARKS**

**Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1-17 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 and 4-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,139. Applicant has included a Terminal Disclaimer herewith to address the rejection. In view of the Terminal Disclaimer, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 1-17.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Revilla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,614). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 7 is allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains that the system disclosed in Revilla et al. does not disclose an integrated circuit with a reset connection that has a bias circuit coupled to it during a test operation and where the reset connection can receive an elevated voltage during the test operation, where the elevated voltage is greater than Vcc. *See*, Revilla et al., Figure 2; Column 3, line 52 to Column 4, line 18; and Column 5, lines 23-60. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Revilla et al. fails to teach or disclose all elements of claim 7.

Applicant's claim 7, as amended, recites “[a] method of operating an integrated circuit comprising initiating a test operation of the integrated circuit; and activating a bias circuit coupled to a reset connection of the integrated circuit during the test operation to bias the reset connection, wherein the reset connection can receive an elevated voltage during the test operation, where the elevated voltage is greater than Vcc.” As detailed above, Applicant submits that Revilla et al. fails to teach or disclose such a method of operating an integrated circuit. As such, Revilla et al. fails to teach or disclose all elements of claim 7.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 7 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of claim 7.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated over Revilla et al. in view of Sakaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,675). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 8 is allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Revilla et al. fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 7, from which claim 8 depends. In addition, Applicant respectfully maintains that Sakaki discloses an IC card system that has a terminal contact fault detection and does not teach or suggest coupling a high voltage to a reset connection of an integrated circuit during a test operation. *See*, Sakaki, Abstract and Summary. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Revilla et al. with Sakaki fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 7 and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of dependent claim 8, either alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 7 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claim 8 depends from and further defines claim 7 it is also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 8.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 9-11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 9-11 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection, and allowance of claims 9-11.

Claims 1-6 and 12-19 were allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2207.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/18/05



Andrew C. Walseth  
Reg. No. 43,234

Attorneys for Applicant  
Leffert Jay & Polglaze  
P.O. Box 581009  
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009  
T 612 312-2200  
F 612 312-2250